

J. Coats

NUMBER 3.

unconstitutional power. If congress possess the power to alter our boundaries, and to annex the disputed territory to Ohio, then is the act which they have passed, the supreme law of the land, any thing in the constitution of the state of Michigan to the contrary. By the second section of the fifth article of the federal constitution it is declared, that "this constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land :—so that the judges of every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding." What stronger security could be required by the state of Ohio, for the protection of her rights, than this, if congress which has been exercised by the power belongs to them? If the act of congress be passed in pursuance of the constitution of the United States, it is the supreme law of the land, and the judges of the courts of Michigan are bound to obey its provisions, "any thing in our state constitution to the contrary notwithstanding." I would ask then, if the sanction required by the people of Michigan to this legislation, does not imply a doubt on the part of congress as to the constitutionality of their own act?

The power of congress over the question of our admission being confined to the simple inquiry,—is the constitution and a